

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 21-26, 28-37, 39-45, and 48-52 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, and 48 and CANCELS claims 38, 46, and 47.

Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 47 and 48 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 37 to properly recite statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 21-24, 27-29, 31-35, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Makoto (JP 2003-016595). Claims 25, 26, 36, 41-44, 51, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima (U.S. 5,764,139). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Shimizu (U.S. 7,366,595). Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Shimizu. Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Ohishi (U.S. 5,926,153). Claims 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Official Notice.

Applicant has amended claim 41 to recite all of the features of allowable claim 47 and intervening claim 46, has amended allowable claim 48 to be in independent form including all of the features of previously presented claim 41 from which claim 48 depended, and has canceled claims 46 and 47. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 41-44, 51, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, claim 45 was 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Shimizu, claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Ohishi, and claims 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto in view of Nojima, and further in view of Official Notice are now moot.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 21-26, 28-37, 39, and 40.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite:

An onboard display device for displaying an image outside of a vehicle inputted from an image capture section on a display screen, the onboard display device comprising:

a display control section arranged to receive an image display instruction for checking a rightward or a leftward outside area of the vehicle, and to cause the display screen to display a rightward outside area image or a leftward outside area image of the vehicle, the rightward outside area image or the leftward outside area image being captured by the image capture section; and

an image processing section arranged to cause a manner in which the rightward outside area image is displayed to be different from a manner in which the leftward outside area image is displayed; wherein

**the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different frames on the display screen, the different frames having different shapes from each other.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's claims 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 recite features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 21, including the above-emphasized features.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Makoto teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's claim 21. More specifically, the Examiner alleged that Makoto teaches, along with the rest of the features presently recited in Applicant's claim 21, that "the image processing device is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different shaped frames (left hand side is displayed on the left, and right hand side is displayed on the right side into split screen, paragraph 9) on the display screen." The Examiner rejected Applicant's claims 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 for similar reasons.

Even though Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's allegations that one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have considered the left hand side image and the right hand side image of Makoto as having different shapes, in order to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended claim 21 to further

April 4, 2011

Reply to the Office Action dated January 6, 2011

Page 13 of 15

emphasize the features of Applicant's invention by reciting the feature of "the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different frames on the display screen, the different frames having different shapes from each other." Support for this feature can be found, for example, in Applicant's previously presented but presently canceled claim 27 and in Figs. 4A, 4B, 5B, and 5D of Applicant's Drawings. Claims 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 have also been amended to recite similar features.

Makoto teaches a vehicle including a plurality of cameras arranged to capture images of the outside surroundings of the vehicle. The vehicle further includes a vehicle drive assist device with a display separated into a left side section and a right side section that displays, along with, for example, a GPS navigation image, (i) a leftward image captured by a leftward outside camera on a left side of a display section when the vehicle is making make a left turn, and (ii) a rightward outside image captured by a rightward outside camera on a right side of the display section when the vehicle is to make a right turn, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4 of Makoto.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the leftward image in the left side of the display section and the rightward image in the right side of the display section correspond to different shaped frames. However, as can be clearly seen in Figs. 3 and 4 of Makoto (marked-up portions of which are produced below), both the leftward image and the rightward image are presented in identically shaped square frames.

Leftward and Rightward Images are  
Produced in Identically Shaped Square Frames

(b) 左側監視画像



(b) 右側監視画像



Thus, Makoto clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different frames on the display screen, the different frames having different shapes from each other” as recited in Applicant’s claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Makoto.

The Examiner relied upon Nojima and Shimizu to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Makoto. However, Nojima and Shimizu clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of “the image processing section is arranged to display the rightward outside area image and the leftward outside area image in different frames on the display screen, the different frames having different shapes from each other” as recited in Applicant’s claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Nojima and Shimizu fail to cure the deficiencies of Makoto described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Makoto, Nojima, and Shimizu, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant’s claims 21, 22, 35, 36, 39, and 40.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41 are allowable. Claims 23-26, 28-34, 37, 42-45, and 48-52 depend upon claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 21, 22, 35, 36, and 39-41 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Application No. 10/598,090

April 4, 2011

Reply to the Office Action dated January 6, 2011

Page 15 of 15

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2011

/Erik Preston #64,733/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Erik Preston  
Registration No. 64,733